

**B. REMARKS**

In the above-noted Office Action, claims 8-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Woody et al (US 6,488,345). In the present submission, Applicant amends claims 8 and 12. Reexamination and reconsideration of the non-allowed claims are respectfully requested.

Woody et al discloses a regenerative braking system for a batteriless fuel cell vehicle (with the exception of a small battery that does not power the electric motor driving the wheels). In Column 3, line 55 and Column 4, lines 10-20, Woody only refers to a battery in regards to prior art devices or to a small 12 volt battery, as described in Column 5, line 46.

In sharp contrast, Applicant provides a method utilizing a vehicle which has a battery 106 that can store power to a motor which is provided in the drive train of the vehicle. By allowing storage of energy from regenerative braking to the battery, Applicant provides a method of dissipation of electrical power in a vehicle that is more environmentally efficient. Also, Applicant provides a method of control wherein a feed-forward output signal is utilized to adjust the compressor speed. Nowhere does Woody bring forth such a control system.

As provided in Claim 12, Applicant provides a method wherein the compressor can create a vacuum. This vacuum can be utilized to power vacuum actuated systems of the vehicle, and/or can be utilized to power a booster to allow the operation of a conventional friction induced braking system for the vehicle. In the state of current technologies, friction induced braking is virtually required to meet federal motor vehicle standards with regard to braking of the vehicle. Accordingly, Applicant provides a method wherein such a vehicle can still have a conventional power braking system.

Applicant's response to the rejection of claims 11, 14, 15 and 17 is inherent in Applicant's response to the rejection of claim 8. In the interest of conserving the Examiner's valuable time, such additional response is not repeated.

By this amendment Applicant has shown wherein the Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed. As the application is in condition for allowance, such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Ernest E. Helms, Registration No. 29,721

DYKEMA GOSSETT PLLC

39577 Woodward Avenue, Suite 300

Bloomfield Hills, MI 48304-2820

(248) 203-0756

Attorneys for Applicant

Dated: January 3, 2005